

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10 **WESTERN DIVISION**
11

12 TODD R.G. HILL,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 THE BOARD AND DIRECTORS,
16 OFFICERS, AND AGENTS AND
INDIVIDUALS OF PEOPLES
COLLEGE OF LAW, et al.,

17 Defendants.
18

No. 2:23-cv-01298-JLS-BFM

**ORDER DENYING
RECONSIDERATION**

19 **INTRODUCTION**

20 Before the Court is Plaintiff Todd R.G. Hill's Motion for reconsideration
21 of the Court's Order accepting the Magistrate Judge's Interim Report and
22 Recommendation. (ECF 253.) That Order dismissed many of the claims in
23 Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint without leave to amend and dismissed
24 Defendants associated with the State Bar of California with prejudice. (See ECF
25 248.)

26 For the reasons stated below, the Court **DENIES** the Motion for
27 reconsideration.
28

BACKGROUND

On February 12, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued an Interim Report and Recommendation, recommending dismissal of Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint. (See ECF 213.) The Report recommended dismissal of all of Plaintiff's federal claims without leave to amend, with the narrow exception of his civil RICO claim. (ECF 213 at 29-30.) It also recommended dismissing all Defendants associated with the State Bar of California with prejudice. (ECF 213 at 32.)

Plaintiff filed Objections to the Interim Report and Recommendation (ECF 217) and several motions for judicial notice of various documents. (See ECF 222, 224, 227, 228, 232, 243.) He also filed a Motion for reconsideration reiterating points he raised in previous motions. (ECF 237.)

The Court accepted the Magistrate Judge's Interim Report and Recommendation on March 27, 2025. (ECF 248). Plaintiff again sought reconsideration on March 28, 2025. (ECF 253.) In his most recent Motion, Plaintiff argues that the Court committed clear error in accepting the Interim Report and Recommendation and failed to consider certain arguments and "newly" discovered evidence. Plaintiff later filed a supplement with additional "newly discovered" evidence. (ECF 259.)

DISCUSSION

I. Legal Standard

Motions for reconsideration are governed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). Reconsideration of a court's order is an "extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources." *Kona Enters., Inc. v. Estate of Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted). Motions for reconsideration should not be granted

“unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law.” *389 Orange St Partners v. Arnold*, 179 F.3d 656 (9th Cir. 1999). Motions for reconsideration may not “be used to raise arguments or present evidence for the first time when they could reasonably have been raised earlier in the litigation.” *Kona Enters.*, 229 F.3d at 890.

Motions for reconsideration are also governed by Local Rule 7-18, which provides:

A motion for reconsideration of an Order on any motion or application may be made only on the grounds of (a) a material difference in fact or law from that presented to the Court that, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been known to the party moving for reconsideration at the time the Order was entered, or (b) the emergence of new material facts or a change of law occurring after the Order was entered, or (c) a manifest showing of a failure to consider material facts presented to the Court before the Order was entered. No motion for reconsideration may in any manner repeat any oral or written argument made in support of, or in opposition to, the original motion.

L.R. 7-18.

II. Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration

Plaintiff fails to establish any basis for reconsideration. He does not identify any material difference in fact or law that could not have been known with reasonable diligence at the time of the Court’s decision, nor does he establish a failure to consider material facts. *See* L.R. 7-18. Moreover, all of Plaintiff’s arguments were either raised before or could have been raised in previous pleadings. With respect to the latter category of arguments, the Motion

1 does not explain why those arguments could not have been raised earlier.

2 The only new evidence that could not have been presented sooner is the
3 April 2025 memorandum issued by the State Bar of California, which
4 summarizes the oversight and administrative functions of the Board of Trustees
5 and the Committee of Bar Examiners. (ECF 259 at 16-21.) The Magistrate
6 Judge concluded that Plaintiff's claims against the State Bar failed, principally,
7 because he had not plausibly alleged that that entity or its employees acted with
8 intent to discriminate. (*See, e.g.*, ECF 213 at 14-16 (dismissing Plaintiff's equal
9 protection claim for failing to plausibly allege the State Bar acted with intent to
10 discriminate).) And nothing in the State Bar memorandum suggests a different
11 conclusion. As such, though this evidence was not previously before the Court,
12 it does not warrant revisiting the prior decision to adopt the Report and
13 Recommendation.

14
15 **CONCLUSION**

16 For the foregoing reasons, the court **DENIES** the Motion for
17 Reconsideration (ECF 253).

18
19 DATED: May 27, 2025



20
21 **HONORABLE JOSEPHINE L. STATON**
22 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**
23
24
25
26
27
28